

U.S. Department of Justice

United States Attorney
Southern District of New York

The Silvio J. Mollo Building One Saint Andrew's Plaza New York, New York 10007

June 9, 2008

MEMO ENDORSED

By Facsimile
The Honorable P. Kevin Castel
United States District Judge
Southern District of New York
Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse
500 Pearl Street, Room 2260
New York, New York 10007-1312

Re: United States v. Martin S. Bodner
08 Cr. 282 (PKC)

USDS SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 6 - 10 - 08

Dear Judge Castel:

In advance of the conference currently scheduled for Wednesday, June 11, 2008, at 9:45 a.m., the Government writes to inform the Court regarding the status of the above-referenced case.

The parties continue to work towards a resolution of the charges contained in the Information. The parties have largely agreed upon a disposition of the charges in the Information and what remains is to complete an agreement concerning the forfeiture by the defendant of various assets. The parties are currently in the process of resolving several factual questions regarding the amount of what the Government contends are fraud proceeds that were invested in various properties. The parties continue to believe that a negotiated resolution will render unnecessary substantial forfeiture-related litigation before the Court.

The parties are prepared to appear before the Court on June 11. However, should the Court believe the conference unnecessary, in light of the update set out above, the parties would then request that the Court set a date during the second week of July 2008 for a further proceeding, at which time the parties expect the defendant to enter a guilty plea.

Should the Court adjourn next conference, the Government requests that, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A), the Court exclude time between June 11, 2008, and the

The Honorable P. Kevin Castel June 9, 2008 Page 2

next conference set by the Court and submits, based on the foregoing, that the ends of justice served by the granting of an requested exclusion outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

Based on my correspondence with Matthew I. Menchel, Esq., counsel to the defendant, who has reviewed this letter in draft form, I can represent that the defendant does not object to an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act.

a.m./p.m.

pe July 15, 2008 at 9:500 The need for a continuouse for the reasons stated in the little outwerf the Best the little outwerf the Best

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL J. GARCIA United States Attorney Southern District of New York

returned of the dependent on a speed tria rubeix in a speed tria True excluded culit date next inferce. June 11 angueixa.

Daniel W. Lew Assistant United States Attorney Telephone: (212) 637-1062

SO ORDERED:

The Honorable F. Kevin Castel

Next conference scheduled for:

Date

cc: (by facsimile)

Steven G. Kobre, Esq. Matthew I. Menchel, Esq. Kobre & Kim LLP 800 Third Avenue New York, New York 10022